California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative

Projected Budgets to Accompany the San Francisco Bay Options Report: Considering MPA Planning September 2011

Overview

The Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) San Francisco Bay Study Region (SFSR) is the fifth and final study region in which marine protected areas (MPAs) might be redesigned consistent with the MLPA, but it has not been determined whether an MPA planning process will take place in the region. Preparation of a San Francisco Bay Options Report (Options Report) is consistent with the MLPA Initiative MOU, and was commissioned by the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force. The Options Report lays out a range of potential options while this budget narrative and the attached spreadsheet projects a budget for each of the six options.

Budgeting Approach

As noted in the Options Report, the necessary funding and resources increases with each successive option, from Option 0 to Option 5. For this exercise we emulated the budgeting process and layout utilized to date for the MLPA Initiative for the four open coast study regions.

We have carefully reviewed each proposed option and associated components detailed in Table 2 of the Options Report and then reviewed and compared budgets and projections from previous study regions. With this basis we either condensed or expanded the various option components to the budget items in our standard MLPA Initiative budget spreadsheet.

Option 5 calls for the most comprehensive MPA planning process and thus would require the highest level of resources and budget. Using the projected Option 5 budget as the most comprehensive and costly we subtracted various components not called for in Options 1-4 to derive budgets for those options. While Option 0 does not suggest a process, nonetheless, there are minimal costs associated with communicating Options Zero; please see the attached budget spreadsheet.

Described below are key assumptions and how the components of each option were condensed or expanded to fit the standardized MLPA Initiative budget spreadsheet.

Key Assumptions

The Options Report describes the key components for Options 0 through 5 (see Table 2). Here we provide key assumptions related to each component and a reference to how associated costs are accounted for in the attached budget spreadsheet.

Public Outreach and Education

Website - as in all previous study regions the cost and maintenance of a website would be borne by the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG). The content would be developed by DFG, California State Parks (CSP) and MLPA Initiative staff.

California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative Projected Budgets to Accompany the San Francisco Bay Options Report: Considering MPA Planning September 2011

List servers – to be hosted by the California Natural Resources Agency or DFG, managed by the MLPA Initiative program manager with some clerical support.

Print materials – would require an administrative / clerical support contract. This cost is covered in the budget category: administration and support.

In-house copier - Xerox copier maintenance contract would need to be extended, the machine is now housed with DFG. This cost is covered in the budget category: administration and support.

External copier costs (e.g. Kinkos) - This cost is covered in the budget category: meetings/workshops/travel.

Key Communicators – this responsibility would be supported by a public education/outreach coordinator contract. See budget category: contracted personnel/full time.

Public Workshops/Information sessions – tasks supported by public education/outreach coordinator and logistics coordinator, see budget category: contracted personnel/full time.

Process Groups

Dedicated I-Team – mostly comprised of full-time contractors including an executive director, program manager, principal planner, planner, policy analysts, regional coordinator, and information officer, see budget category: contracted personnel/full time.

Dedicated Public Outreach and Education (POE) Team – managed by the public education/outreach coordinator. Team members would likely include other I-Team and agency staff. Cost covered in budget category – contracted personnel/full time.

Convene Science Advisory Team (SAT) – a science advisory team would be supported by science advisors. Cost covered in budget category – contracted personnel/full time.

Convene Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) – introduces the need for an executive director and additional travel and meeting costs. Cost covered in budget categories – contracted personnel/full time and meetings/workshops/travel.

Convening an Advisory Group – introduces the need for an executive director, program manager, facilitator(s), planners and policy analysts, and additional travel and meeting costs. Cost covered in budget categories – contracted personnel/full time and meetings/workshops/travel.

Bay Area Partners – Options 1-5 describe potential roles for Bay Area Agency and nongovernment partner staff to work with or in some cases supplement DFG and California State Parks staff and Initiative contractors. The actual level of commitment from Bay Area Partners will need to be determined once a preferred option is implemented. California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative Projected Budgets to Accompany the San Francisco Bay Options Report: Considering MPA Planning September 2011

Habitat Mapping

Beyond using the best available information to support an MLPA Initiative-type planning process, we did not project a separate line item budget for the collection or acquisition of new data. In the other study regions the Ocean Protection Council provided funding for the collection and acquisition of new data.

Timeline

Based on the timelines for prior study regions we estimate that the most process intensive options – Option Three, Four and Five – would take approximately one year to complete the community planning phase. This phase culminates with the delivery of a recommendation(s) by a blue ribbon task force to the California Fish and Game Commission.

We estimate that a subsequent CEQA regulatory process would take approximately nine months to a one year to complete, culminating with a decision by the California Fish and Game Commission. Options One and Two would take approximately three to six months.

Roles of the California Department of Fish and Game and California State Parks

Personnel – level of personnel dedication for Options 0 to 5 to be determined by DFG and California State Parks. SF Options Report Excerpt Table 2: Comparison of components included in Options 0-5.

California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative Projected Budgets to Accompany San Francisco Bay Options Report (Private Funds Only) Dates to be determined

Updated September 30, 2011

Funding, Resources and Timeline increases with each option ----->

BUDGET ITEM	Phase 4 Total Budget Dates TBD	Option 0 (zero)	Option 1 (3 mos.)	Option 2 (6 mos.)	Option 3 (one year)	Option 4 (one year)	Option 5 (one year)
Contracted Personnel							
Full-Time Contractors (includes executive director, program manager, principal planner, planners, policy analysts, regional coordinator, information officer)		NA*	\$ 99,000	\$ 198,000	\$ 706,000	\$ 806,000	\$ 856,000
Part-Time Contractors (includes GIS specialist, logistics support, science advisors)		NA	NA	\$ 63,000	\$ 130,000	\$ 175,000	\$ 191,000
Contracted Research and Development							
Biological/Socioeconomic Research		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ 375,000
GIS/Mapping/Databases		NA	\$ 19,500	\$ 300,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 600,000
Environmental Review, Documentation and Analysis		NA	NA	NA	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000
Stakeholder Participation		NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000
Policy Research, Technical Writing		NA	NA	NA	\$ 60,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000
Meetings/Workshops/Travel							
Facility, Logistics, Travel, Lodging, Per Diem, Stipends, Communications		NA	\$ 2,500	\$ 10,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000
Administration and Support							
Computers, Equipment, Supplies		NA	\$ 5,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000
Total		\$ -	\$ 126,000	\$ 581,000	\$ 2,261,000	\$ 2,926,000	\$ 3,367,000